

REMARKS

In the Office action, claims 1, 8, 10-12, 28, 29, 31-33, 35-37, 42, 43 and 48-51 were rejected as anticipated by Fischli et al; claims 2, 3, 14, 30 and 34 were rejected as being unpatentable over Fischli in view of Diaz; claims 9 and 39 were rejected as being unpatentable over Fischli in view of Ribnitz; claim 38 was rejected as being unpatentable over Fischli in view of Shutic; and claims 4-7, 13, 40 and 41 were indicated as being allowable in independent form.

Claim 48 has been amended to recite that the first collection device is outside the spray booth. Claim 48 further recites that powder is conveyed from the first collection device to the application system under vacuum. In Fischli, powder from the cyclone 46 simply drops into the container 56. Therefore, Fischli cannot anticipate claim 48 as amended.


As to the rejections of independent claims 1 and 28, reconsideration is respectfully requested. Claim 1 recites that the first collection device is a cyclone and that a vacuum is used to transfer powder from the first collection device to a second collection device. In Fischli, powder simply drops from the cyclone 46 into the container 56. There is no vacuum source for this transfer, therefore, Fischli cannot anticipate claim 1. Claim 28 recites that the collection device is located outside the spray booth and a vacuum device conveys powder from the collection device to the feed hopper. Although the cyclone in Fischli is outside the booth, powder simply falls into the container 56. There is no vacuum transfer, therefore, Fischli cannot anticipate claim 28. Note in Fischli that the collection device 34.1 and 34.2 actually form part of the booth, they are not outside the booth as is the cyclone 46.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of the dependent claims as these claims recite additional patentable subject matter, however, further comment is deferred pending reconsideration of the rejection of the independent claims.

It is respectfully submitted that the claims are allowable over the art of record and favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 26, 2004

By: 
Leonard L. Lewis Reg. No 31,176
(216) 622-8683